

ISD High School #04 Elementary School #17 - Public Comment Summary Matrix PRJ19-00008 Attachment 081
 File Nos. PRJ19-00008, SDP20-00001, MSP20-00001, AAS20-00012, AAS21-00001, AAS21-00002, AAS21-00005, AAS21-00006

Community Conference July 15, 2020 COM20-00001			
Comment	Topic	Response	
A1 Applicant did not supply enough information on the traffic and environmental impacts of the project during the Community Conference. There was not adequate opportunity to provide public comment due to the virtual meeting format. Hold a new meeting when residents can participate in person and the applicant has sufficient information to answer questions.	Process	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, Section VII.A.5, Sections VI.C and VI.D	
A2 School District reducing the stormwater treatment requirements by stating that students are not employees. Concerned that tree retention will not offset the impact of filling one wetland. The applicant should spend more time developing a creative approach that works with the existing topography of the parcel instead of grading so much. The need for ballfields does not align with the existing character.	Environmental; Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VII.E.2, Section VI.E.9 and 10, Section VII.A.2.b.c.1	
A3 Property access should be realigned to north on 228th NE to the property line. Reverse the locations of the football and baseball stadiums	Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VII.A.4	
A4 Application materials were difficult to access and understand. Reducing the number a mature trees seems like it will impact wildlife habitat, why has it been said that this project has no significant environmental impacts? How much existing vegetation will remain? Proposed mitigation does not seem like enough	Process; Environmental	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Sections VII.14.i and j, Section VI.E	
A5 Would like the opportunity to salvage native plants before construction begins	Environmental	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83	
A6 What is required to obtain clearance to go to the site and salvage plants?	Environmental	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83	
A7 Will there be room to add a dog park?	Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 The City of Issaquah cannot require a dog park on this site.	
A8 Concerned about safety issues regarding the close proximity of a high school to the Providence Point Community. Will there be access from the campus to Providence Point? Can the school district propose a STEM facility instead of a standard school building so they don't need to build so many ball fields?	Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VII.A.9, Section VII.A.4, Section V.C	
A9 It is difficult to sign up for classes and activities for my kids. Excited about a new school this is long overdue and should be built as soon as possible.	Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83	
A10 Concerned about the SEPA process and possible conflict of interest. Why is ISD acting as their own lead agency?	Process	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VI.E	
A11 Received inconsistent noticing for the community conference, how does the city determine who to send notifications to? Will the developer take impacts to the providence point community into account? Are the impacts of COVID19 on school space needs being considered?	Process; Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Sections VI.C and VI.D, Section VII.2.d	
A12 The lights and noise associated with ball fields will have a negative impact on the Providence Point Community, especially rehab and hospice centers. This project should be put on pause until these impacts are properly accounted for	Environmental; Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14	
A13 What will the new high school boundaries be?	Programming	School district boundaries are set by ISD. No information on school district boundaries was provided in this application.	
A14 How many trees will be preserved as a buffer for light and noise? Will this be sufficient? How else will noise impacts be mitigated. Please note that Providence point is a 55+ condo community with no children and no apartments in the project description	Environmental; Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VI.E.2, Section V.C	
A15 Concerned about tree loss. As many trees as possible should be maintained to act as a buffer between the school and the community. Concerned about the amount of grading proposed for the baseball field and the visual and environmental impact of the retaining walls.	Programming; Environmental	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Sections VII.14.i and j, Section VII.A.2.b.c.1	
A16 What will the new high school boundaries be?	Programing	School district boundaries are set by ISD. No information on school district boundaries was provided in this application.	
A17 Concerned about traffic impacts. How will the city of Issaquah and city of Sammamish coordinate road improvements to alleviate new congestion along 228th? The location and lack of continuous sidewalks makes it unsafe for kids to walk to school	Traffic	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VII.A.4.k	
A18 Property size is inadequate for two schools, FAR is too low, stadium is not needed, privacy and security of adjacent properties is not well-protected, elementary school and high school collocation is unsafe, environmental impacts have not been reviewed, traffic impacts are a major concern.	Environmental, Programming, Traffic, Safety	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83	
A19 Concerned that there is not enough room on the parcel for all the proposed programs and adequate buffering. Not enough trees are being retained. The stadium will have Significant noise impacts why does the school district need to build another one when there is an existing stadium at Skyline. Will the school even have enough space to deal with future growth	Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section V.C, Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14	
A20 There is already too much traffic along 228th between Issaquah and Sammamish. This project will make those issues worse and don't seem properly mitigated. Concerned that high school aged kids might have a negative impact on elementary school children. Will there be enough classrooms on site to deal with future growth? The traffic and noise issues from such a large development could have a detrimental effect on the retirement and Hospice communities adjacent to the property.	Traffic; Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VII.A.4.k, Section V.C, Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14	
A21 No geotechnical report was made available for this community conference	Process	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Attachment 37 "Geotechnical Report prepared by AESI, dated September 17, 2019 and revised June 17, 2021"	
A22 Site constraints including limited public access and hilly terrain, FAR is too low, street noise will impact PPUA, stadium will cause lighting and noise impacts and is unneeded, traffic impacts are a major concern, elementary school siting is a poor choice	Environmental, Programming, Traffic	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83	

ISD High School #04 Elementary School #17 - Public Comment Summary Matrix

PRJ19-00008 Attachment 081

File Nos. PRJ19-00008, SDP20-00001, MSP20-00001, AAS20-00012, AAS21-00001, AAS21-00002, AAS21-00005, AAS21-00006

A23	Concerned about the safety due to the close proximity of the high school to a retirement community. Why does the school district need to build a new stadium complex here when they could share the one down the street? It seems like a conflict if interest that the school district is in charge of their own SEPA process	Programming; Process	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VII.A.9, Section VI.E
A24	Concerned about the noise, light, and visual impacts of having a high school so close to the established retirement community. Why is such a large stadium necessary for the school campus	Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VII.C.2, Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14
A25	Why is there not enhanced treatment of stormwater? The drainage from the project will flow into laughing Jacobs Creek straight into Lake Washington, these impacts should be addressed with higher stormwater standards. There should be more tree retention along the border with the providence point community to act as a visual and noise buffer. The proposed school should share facilities with existing school campuses in the ISD to lower the amount of redevelopment on this site	Environmental, Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VII.E.2, Sections VII.14.i and j
A26	Stadium is not needed and could be shared with Skyline, site is too small for a high school or high school and elementary school, site plan fails to acknowledge new pandemic reality. Inadequate notice provided, virtual meeting inadequate for discussion, process has lacked transparency, inadequate SEPA review, inconsistent project documents	Programming, Process, Environmental	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83
A27	Build a small high school and large stadium seems like a better approach for school development. Why does this campus need a stadium? Why can they not share with the stadium down the road at Skyline? I think that ISD could be more creative in designing a future forward high school and elementary school that has less of a visual impact on the surrounding community	Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section IV.B, Section VII.A.1
A28	The site seems too small for everything the school district is trying to build on it. There seem to be larger parcels of land out in Preston and Fall City. There are other schools within close proximity to this parcel. Why was this parcel chosen to be the new school campus? Concerned about the safety impacts of having a high school next to a retirement community as well as the traffic impacts of so many students and teachers.	Programming; Traffic	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section IV.B, Section VII.A.9,
A29	Issaquah school district has a conflict of interest by being their own lead agency in the SEPA process. There isn't any oversight to make sure they aren't ignoring certain laws, rules, and codes. They are requesting variances from the city to get what they want. Concerned about emergency access to the school site and traffic along 228th. These impacts don't seem properly analyzed or mitigated. How are Issaquah and Sammamish Coordinating road improvements? Why is the stadium necessary? it takes up so much space on the parcel that could be dedicated to more school classrooms. Has the school district taken into account the impacts of COVID19 on the education system? This is a huge project with environmental impacts such as tree loss and drainage issues that should be taken seriously	Process; Traffic; Programming; Environmental	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VI.E, Section VII.A.4, VII.F.2, Section VI.E
A30	Are two ball fields necessary? They have a negative visual and noise impact on the residents who face the property. How will the planting of new small trees offset the removal of so many mature significant trees? What is the purpose of off site mitigation if it doesn't help the adjacent residents? The average buffer of 60 feet does not seem sufficient if it can be as narrow as 30 feet in some places. The site design causes air pollution, lighting impacts to neighbors. The project should prioritize additional classroom spaces and STEM programs instead of sports facilities and parking. The project should provide additional virtual infrastructure. The site is too small for all that is planned, and poorly laid out to ensure safety. The stadium is unnecessary and could be shared with Skyline High School, and nighttime events present a safety risk to neighbors. The buildings do not fit into the surrounding neighborhood.	Programming; Environmental	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14, Section VII.C.2, Sections VII.14.i and j and k, Section VI.E.2
A31	City Council should not allow ISD to be lead agency for SEPA because it is a conflict of interest. This project will create a high volume of traffic and the impacts have not been adequately addressed. Why has a transportation management plan not been completed? A more significant buffer should be maintained between the residents and the new school campus. Concerned about the volume and quality of stormwater runoff and how that will affect lake Sammamish and Jacobs Creek	Process; Traffic; Environmental	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VI.E, Section VII.A.13, Section X.A.15, Section VI.E.2
A32	The community conference held for this project did not meet the intent of the code description.	Process	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Sections VI.C and VI.D
A33	There are many issues with the proposed campus access. There is not proper mitigation for the new traffic, new drivers such as teenagers driving to school will be dangerous, and there is no alternative way to access the campus by walking, biking, or public transportation due to the location. Why does the school district need such a large piece of land to put a school and ball fields on. Why cant they find a smaller property elsewhere and not build a stadium where there will be more convenient access? dropping off children will be difficult for parents with the current proposal.	Access, Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section VII.A.4.k, Section VII.A.4, Section VII.A.13
A34	The process does not take into account the adjacent residents opinions. Does not seem like the school district is interested in compromise. The property is too small to fit all the facilities that have been planned without significant alterations to the existing landscape. This lack of respect for the environment does not set a good example for the students who will be attending the school and will impact the local wildlife. Traffic issues such as congestion along 228th are not being addresses adequately.	Programming, Environment	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83 See Staff Report Section IV.B, Sections VII.14.i and j, Section VI.E, Section VII.A.4.k
A35	The Community Conference format was informative but did not give the public the chance to influence the design of the proposal to meet their concerns about environmental and visual impacts. ISD is not taking into account the concerns of the adjacent neighbors. Why does the school district need to build a new stadium when they just built a new facility down to the road at Skyline HS? Why can't they combine the two ballfields?	Process, Programming,	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83
A36	School should prioritize forward-thinking education instead of sports, scale of project inappropriate for residential neighborhood, site constraints make it too difficult to fit everything on the property. See A30.	Programming	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83

ISD High School #04 Elementary School #17 - Public Comment Summary Matrix

PRJ19-00008 Attachment 081

File Nos. PRJ19-00008, SDP20-00001, MSP20-00001, AAS20-00012, AAS21-00001, AAS21-00002, AAS21-00005, AAS21-00006

A37	City staff should lead SEPA review. The stadium should be removed from the plans. An analysis of safety for collocating the high school and elementary school should be performed. Site access is insufficient. Stormwater impacts will be substantial, including to Laughing Jacobs Creek and Lake Sammamish. A TMP should be required to address traffic impacts. Tree retention should meet or exceed City standards. Aesthetic impacts were not properly reviewed under SEPA. Any AAS requests should be consolidated with the MSP and SDP. A noise impact study should be prepared. The Community Conference application materials are inadequate.	Programming, Process, Environmental, Traffic	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83
A38	the site location makes it difficult for students, staff, and visitors to access the property by trail or on foot or bike. The reliance on vehicle access will increase traffic. There should be more thought and care put into trail access to the school and an emphasis on pedestrian safety.	Programming; Traffic	See Community Conference Summary Memo, Attachment 83

ISD High School #04 Elementary School #17 - Public Comment Summary Matrix PRJ19-00008 Attachment 081
 File Nos. PRJ19-00008, SDP20-00001, MSP20-00001, AAS20-00012, AAS21-00001, AAS21-00002, AAS21-00005, AAS21-00006

Environmental Neighborhood Meeting April 15, 2021 NM21-00002			
General		Topic	Response
B1	Laughing Jacobs Creek should be considered a critical area. Laughing Jacobs Creek is spawning habitat for Kokanee salmon which will be impacted by development. Erosion and additional runoff volume from development will have negative downstream impacts. Notice of public meeting should be announced in "Issaquah Finder" and City's development notices.	Environmental; Process	See Attachments 53-57 Stormwater Technical Information reports and related information. See Staff Report Section VI.E.9, Section VII.B. Laughing Jacobs Creek is a stream classified as a critical area in IMC 18.10. Regulations in IMC 18.10 for erosion hazard areas and in IMC 16.26 for stormwater management will address temporary erosion and sedimentation control (TESC) and project design to prevent erosion or sediment from entering Laughing Jacobs Creek. Compliance with stormwater quality and flow control requirements will improve the site stormwater system compared to current conditions.
B2	Concern of limited driving space with one access road for both high school and elementary school. There is no sidewalk to the area so all students will need to be driven or take the bus. Cars back onto 228th and try to get to area too.	Traffic	See Attachments 60-67, traffic-related information. See Staff Report Section VIII.A.5 The Applicant is required to provide frontage improvements, including pedestrian and bicycle improvements. The Applicant also provided a traffic study that identifies potential impacts and required mitigation.
B3	Resident enjoys the current quiet, concern for traffic after development.	Traffic; Programming	See Attachments 60-67, traffic-related information. See Staff Report Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14, Section VII.A.13. The Applicant provided a traffic study identifying potential impacts and recommended mitigation measures, and will be required to implement all recommendations as part of the conditions of approval.
B4	228th Ave SE is a one lane street and will not be able to handle the increased traffic, particularly with Pine Lake Middle School on the corner. Minimum tree retention per Issaquah code is not being met; concern for loss of co-benefits (noise reduction, stormwater uptake, habitat, etc.). Concern for health of remaining wetlands due to hydrologic changes. Laughing Jacobs Creek is spawning ground for Kokanee salmon, changes in stream hydrology should be avoided. City of Sammamish's stormwater regulations should be used instead of Issaquah's. Care should be taken near steep slopes on the site. An Environmental Impact Statement should be prepared. Request to reconsider schools, especially stadiums and track/baseball fields.	Environmental; Traffic	See Attachments 60-67, traffic-related information. See Attachments 53-57, Stormwater Technical Information reports and related information. See Staff Report Section VII.A.4.k, Sections VII.14.i and j, Section VII.B.2.e, Section VII.B, Section VI.E The Applicant provided a traffic study identifying potential impacts and recommended mitigation measures, and will be required to implement all recommendations as part of the conditions of approval. This includes frontage and capacity improvements, a new signal at the main entry, and others. The Applicant requested an Administrative Adjustment of Standards for tree retention, which will be decided by the City Council. There is no practical difference in Issaquah's and Sammamish's stormwater regulations as they apply to this project, and compliance with stormwater quality and flow control requirements will improve site stormwater discharge compared to current conditions. Work near the steep slopes has a limited exemption due to the height/inclination and/or history (man-made) of the slopes.
B5	Concern for health of remaining wetlands due to hydrologic changes. Laughing Jacobs Creek is spawning ground for Kokanee salmon, changes in stream hydrology should be avoided. City of Sammamish's stormwater regulations should be used instead of Issaquah's. Minimum tree retention per Issaquah code is not being met; concern for loss of co-benefits (noise reduction, stormwater uptake, habitat, etc.).	Environmental	See Attachment 38, Critical Areas Study & Wetland Mitigation Plan. See Attachments 53-57, Stormwater Technical Information reports and related information. See Staff Report Section VII.B.2.e, Sections VII.14.i and j, Section VII.B Wetland B will be protected. Stormwater quality and flow control improvements will cause the site to function (from a stormwater perspective) more like a pre-developed, forested site which is an improvement compared to current conditions. There is no practical difference in Issaquah's and Sammamish's stormwater regulations as they apply to this project. The buffer will be enhanced with areas of new plantings that will improve noise reduction, stormwater uptake, and other co-benefits and the health of the buffer will be monitored and maintained by protective easement.
B6	Concern for traffic issues on 228th Ave SE and SE 43rd Way; need for turn lanes, sidewalks, bike paths, and crosswalks. Traffic survey during COVID underestimated traffic impact of development. Concern of additional fuel and traffic due to bused students from Lakemont to Providence Heights. Question of why schools are being built if there is decreased enrollment and funding. Can money be saved by only adding a football practice field and using stadiums nearby?	Traffic; Funding; Programming	See Staff Report Section VII.A.4.k, Section VII.A.13, Section IV.C The Applicant is providing frontage and capacity improvements including turn lanes, sidewalks, bike paths, and crosswalks. The traffic study and related information was peer-reviewed and determined to comply with standard practices for traffic studies. ISD is responsible for districting, bus schedules, enrollment projections, and programming; these are not criteria for approval that can be considered by the City of Issaquah.
B7	Traffic on 228th is already heavy. Noise level is concerning. It is state law to protect salmon in Washington, Laughing Jacobs Creek is endangered salmon habitat. Concern for impact to wetlands, trees, and hillsides. Concern of additional stormwater runoff from the site, specifically increased flooding. Request for SEPA review. Environmental Impact Statement needed.	Traffic; Environmental; Programming	See Attachments 60-67, traffic-related information. See Attachment 46, Noise Study. See Attachments 53-57, Stormwater Technical Information reports and related information. See Staff Report Section VII.A.4.k, Section VII.A.13, Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14, Section VI.E Stormwater quality and flow control improvements will cause the site to function (from a stormwater perspective) more like a pre-developed, forested site which is an improvement compared to current conditions. Wetland impacts will be mitigated consistent with City code requirements through the purchase of mitigation bank credits. Tree removal will be mitigated by replacement plantings consistent with City requirements. Grading is allowed. ISD is the Lead Agency for SEPA and issued an MDNS for this project.
B8	Concern for negative effects of tree removal along the edges of the property. Retaining trees could block the bright lights from the sports fields, reduce impact of exhaust fumes from busses on neighbors, reduce noise from recess and stadium events, maintain habitat for birds and insects, and soften high speed wind events. Removing trees could also devalue neighboring property and reduce quality of life for neighbors.	Environmental	See Staff Report Sections VII.14.i and j Trees will be retained along the edges of the property (except selective removal of trees determined to pose a risk to people, property, or the health of nearby trees), and additional plantings will enhance certain areas of the buffer. Replacement trees will be provided per City requirements.

ISD High School #04 Elementary School #17 - Public Comment Summary Matrix PRJ19-00008 Attachment 081
 File Nos. PRJ19-00008, SDP20-00001, MSP20-00001, AAS20-00012, AAS21-00001, AAS21-00002, AAS21-00005, AAS21-00006

B9	Use of a single entry/exit will not be sufficient to handle traffic, particular concern regarding emergency vehicles/equipment. Increased traffic between Issaquah and Sammamish and at the corner of Providence Point Dr SE and 228th Ave SE and lack of pedestrian pathways is concerning. Minimum tree retention per Issaquah code is not being met; concern for loss of co-benefits (noise reduction, stormwater uptake, habitat, etc.). Concern for health of remaining wetlands due to hydrologic changes. Laughing Jacobs Creek is spawning ground for Kokanee salmon, changes in stream hydrology should be avoided. City of Sammamish's stormwater regulations should be used instead of Issaquah's. Care should be taken near steep slopes on the site. An Environmental Impact Statement should be prepared.	Traffic; Environmental	See Attachments 60-67, traffic-related information. See Staff Report Section VII.A.4.k, Section VII.A.13, Sections VII.14.i and j, Section VII.B.2.e, Section VI.E, Section VII.B The Applicant is providing frontage and capacity improvements including turn lanes, sidewalks, bike paths, and crosswalks. The traffic study and related information was peer-reviewed and determined to comply with standard practices for traffic studies. City of Sammamish is responsible for reviewing and accepting the traffic study as applicable in its 228th Avenue SE right-of-way. Stormwater quality and flow control improvements will cause the site to function (from a stormwater perspective) more like a pre-developed, forested site which is an improvement compared to current conditions. Wetland impacts will be mitigated consistent with City code requirements through the purchase of mitigation bank credits. Tree removal will be mitigated by replacement plantings consistent with City requirements. Grading is allowed. ISD is the Lead Agency for SEPA and issued an MDNS for this project.
B10	Concern of harm to existing wetlands and environment, traffic congestion, noise pollution in neighboring residential areas, safety of children along a busy/congested road, and lack of additional entry/exit routes, emergency access, or evacuation options. Nearby stadiums can be used; stadium is unnecessary with current student numbers. Call to reject project or modify to eliminate stadium and elementary school.	Environmental; Traffic; Safety; Programming	See Attachment 38, Critical Area Study & Wetland Mitigation Plan. See Attachments 60-67, traffic-related information. See Attachment 46, Noise Study. See Staff Report Section VII.B.2.e, Section VII.A.13, Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14, Section VII.A.9. Wetland impacts will be mitigated consistent with City code requirements through the purchase of mitigation bank credits. The Applicant is providing frontage and capacity improvements including turn lanes, sidewalks, bike paths, and crosswalks. The traffic study and related information was peer-reviewed and determined to comply with standard practices for traffic studies. City of Sammamish is responsible for reviewing and accepting the traffic study as applicable in its 228th Avenue SE right-of-way. Eastside Fire & Rescue reviewed the plans and did not note any concerns about the access. Programming is the responsibility of ISD; a stadium is an allowed use.
B11	Traffic in the morning and afternoon will be noisy. Concern for safety of elderly neighbors to move safely into and out of the retirement community. Request to reject school development.	Traffic; Safety; Programming	See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, Section VII.A.4, See Attachments 60-67, traffic-related information The Applicant is required to provide frontage improvements, including pedestrian and bicycle improvements, and to mitigate for traffic impacts. The Applicant also provided a traffic study that identifies potential impacts and required mitigation.
B12	Question with regards to planned fencing between development and Providence Point (has not been answered in the past). Concern for loss of co-benefits of current, mature trees (noise reduction, visual buffers, uptake of stormwater, habitat). Request to save more trees than in the latest site plan. Laughing Jacobs Creek is spawning ground for Kokanee salmon, which must be protected. City of Sammamish's stormwater regulations should be used instead of Issaquah's. Request for the strongest possible restrictions on all pollution (air, water noise) and detailed environmental impact statement. Concern for safety and traffic congestion at site entrance and 43rd Way/228th St. Request for City to require ISD to remove any plans for additional capacity in the future, specifically regarding portables.	Environment; Traffic; Safety; Programming	A combination of fencing and retaining walls will enclose ISD's facilities, but it will not be placed on the property line (except at 228th Avenue SE). Existing fencing at the property line belongs to PPUA. The buffer will be enhanced with areas of new plantings that will improve noise reduction, stormwater uptake, and other co-benefits and the health of the buffer will be monitored and maintained by protective easement. Stormwater quality and flow control improvements will cause the site to function (from a stormwater perspective) more like a pre-developed, forested site which is an improvement compared to current conditions. There is no practical difference in Issaquah's and Sammamish's stormwater regulations as they apply to this project. A noise study was provided with the application materials (Attachment 46) and determined that, as mitigated, the project will not exceed maximum permissible noise levels. The Applicant is required to provide frontage improvements, including pedestrian and bicycle improvements, and to mitigate for traffic impacts. The Applicant also provided a traffic study that identifies potential impacts and required mitigation. ISD is the Lead Agency for SEPA and issued an MDNS for this project. Portables are allowed. Any increased capacity exceeds the parameters of the MSP and SDP and would need to be reviewed as a revision.

ISD High School #04 Elementary School #17 - Public Comment Summary Matrix PRJ19-00008 Attachment 081
 File Nos. PRJ19-00008, SDP20-00001, MSP20-00001, AAS20-00012, AAS21-00001, AAS21-00002, AAS21-00005, AAS21-00006

B13	Concerns on behalf of Providence Point community. Request for description of wetland hydrology preservation post-construction. Request for reasoning behind support for reduced tree retention; request for no deviation from tree retention standards. Is this meeting a required part of the critical area review under Issaquah codes? When will the final environmental checklist be prepared for this proposal? When will a threshold determination for this proposal be prepared under SEPA? Does the review being undertaken of the environment and of critical areas include the impacts from the new intersection proposed by ISD on 228th Avenue S.E.? Does the stormwater system route runoff to the City of Sammamish and Laughing Jacob's Creek? Has ISD filed applications with the City of Sammamish to construct this intersection? Is the City of Issaquah considering adverse environmental impacts to LJC from the construction of this proposal? Is it considering the environmental impacts from the intersection with 228th? Please identify or provide any reports and studies that consider such impacts. Will the City of Issaquah recommend that an environmental impact statement be prepared for this project? What steps has the City taken to avoid impacts on critical areas such as Laughing Jacobs Creek and on-site wetlands? Has the City required that low-impact development techniques be installed to mitigate for stormwater impacts? Does the City concede that the significant amount of impervious surface to be installed by ISD will greatly increase the volume of stormwater that is discharged downstream? Has the City or ISD quantified these impacts? Please provide references to any studies of these increases in total volume of water. Has the City conducted any peer-review of the ISD studies on wetlands, wetland hydrology, arborist or stream impacts? If so, please provide these peer-review studies or references to them. Concern regarding intersection improvements on 228th Ave SE; request that ISD does not piecemeal environmental review between the City of Sammamish and City of Issaquah. ISD needs to file an application with the City of Sammamish for intersection improvements. Request for additional information regarding conservation easement including its location, size, terms, and potential grantee. Request for drafts or memos regarding such an easement. There are two deficiencies in The Subsurface Exploration, Geologic Hazard, and Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report, dated February 24, 2021 (1) Geologic analysis at the intersection on 228th Ave SE should be completed, with a thorough review of existing conditions. Concerns of seepage and interflow. Traffic improvements at this intersection as a result of the development should be considered with respect to impact on critical areas. (2) the report states on page 13 that "moderately rapid groundwater seepage was observed in 11 of the AESI exploration pits." Development could cut off interflow and impact downslope areas and reduce stormwater infiltration. Request that this is carefully studied.	Environment	See Attachment 38 "Critical Area Study & Wetland Mitigation Plan prepared by Wetland Resources Inc., dated July 10, 2020 and revised February 22, 2021" and Staff Report Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Sections VI.C and VI.D, Section VI.E See Attachment 73 "SEPA Lead Agency Memo," Attachment 74 "Final SEPA Threshold Determination," Attachment 75 "SEPA Checklist," and Staff Report Section VII.E.2.a and b, Section VII.B, VII.A.14.g, Section VII.B, and Section VIII.A.3 ISD is the Lead Agency for SEPA and issued an MDNS for this project. An application for frontage improvements in the City of Sammamish is not required for land use approval. See Attachments 53-57, Stormwater Technical Information Reports and related information. Stormwater quality and flow control improvements will cause the site to function (from a stormwater perspective) more like a pre-developed, forested site which is an improvement compared to current conditions. Geotechnical report was peer reviewed and determined to meet applicable requirements in IMC 18.10.
B14	Until the Laughing Jacob Creek Study funded by Sammamish and Issaquah is completed, it is difficult or impossible to know the negative impact the storm water runoff will have on the Creek. What is the status of that study and how is this project addressing the impacts to the creek and to any plans that study will propose? The critical aquifer recharge area is part of this property but the Neighborhood Meeting – File No. PRJ19-00008 on page 3 seems to say that a study is not required because of IMC 18.10.410(B). Information requested regarding the waiver for that requirement.	Environment	See Staff Report Section VII.B.3. See Attachments 53-57, Stormwater Technical Information Reports and related information. Stormwater quality and flow control improvements will cause the site to function (from a stormwater perspective
B15	Concern about student behavior along the property boundary with Providence Point. Request for a woodland buffer on the school side of the boundary, specifically a high fence or wall that prevents climbing and entry to the buffer except as permitted by locked gates.	Safety; Programming	See Staff Report Section VII.A.14.e and f. Conjecture about potential student behavior or misbehavior is not a criterion of approval; ISD is responsible for enforcing rules related to student behavior on its campuses. The vegetated buffer will be between the school facilities and the Providence Point property line. A combination of fencing and walls will extend around the perimeter of ISD's facilities. An existing fence owned by PPUA is on the property line.
B16	Concern that 'streams' was not checked in the Specific Critical Area Information document. Laughing Jacobs Creek is a rare stream supporting Kokanee salmon and should not be impacted by project.	Environment	See Staff Report Section VII.B. Laughing Jacobs Creek is not on the site.
B17	Concerns about the environmental impact of increased impervious surface due to development, including an artificial surface in the football stadium, effect on Lake Sammamish and Laughing Jacobs Creek and the children that play in those waterways. Concern regarding replacement of natural forest with facsimile environment. Question with regards to the layout of the site, suggestion that the same programming can fit in a smaller area. Concern regarding traffic on the site, subsequent pollution, and development of parking lots and right-of-way for buses. ISD can incentivize less driving with more realistic solutions than stop signs. Request that site be built to higher environmental standards as a model for future generations.	Environment; Traffic	See Staff Report Sections VII.14.i and j, Section IV.B, Section VII.A.4, Section VI.E Stormwater quality and flow control improvements will cause the site to function (from a stormwater perspective) more like a pre-developed, forested site which is an improvement compared to current conditions. ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.
B18	Concerns regarding the effect of the development steep slopes along 228th Ave SE. Groundwater already affects homeowners that backup to 228th Ave SE and it could get worse. Concern regarding the surface water that travels towards the Sammamish Highlands Neighborhood, particularly with widening 228th Ave SE. Suggestion that sidewalks, road drainage, and redirect could help. Concern of runaway vehicles entering 228th Ave SE, suggestion of a safety barrier at the light to protect residential homes. Concern regarding increased road noise, suggestion of noise wall on east side of 228th Ave SE from SE40th St to 43rd Way. Concern about traffic cutting through Sammamish Highlands Neighborhood, suggestion of speed bumps. Concern regarding residents' ability to enter onto 228th Ave SE with increased traffic, suggestion of a traffic light at 228th Ave SE/SE 40th St.	Environment; Traffic	See Attachment 42, Geotechnical Report. See Attachments 53-57, Stormwater Technical Information Reports and related information. See Staff Report Section VII.B.1.a, Section VII.B.1.2.b.7, Section VII.A.4.k Stormwater quality and flow control improvements will cause the site to function (from a stormwater perspective) more like a pre-developed, forested site which is an improvement compared to current conditions. Sidewalks and right-of-way stormwater improvements will be provided with the project. The Applicant is providing frontage improvements and capacity improvements consistent with the recommendations in the traffic study. The noise study indicated that, as mitigated, noise would not exceed maximum permissible noise levels. ISD may pursue a school zone to control speed on 228th Avenue SE, but that would be determined by the City of Sammamish. A "Flying T" configuration for the SE 40th Street intersection is proposed.
B19	Participant was unable to connect to the meeting audio. Request for recording of the event.	Process	Environmental neighborhood meetings are not recorded.
B20	Suggestion to remove some of the sports facilities on the site, especially the stadium. Suggestion to improve existing facilities at Issaquah High School and Skyline High School to accommodate sharing. This would allow some existing, mature trees to remain.	Programming; Environment	ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.

ISD High School #04 Elementary School #17 - Public Comment Summary Matrix PRJ19-00008 Attachment 081
 File Nos. PRJ19-00008, SDP20-00001, MSP20-00001, AAS20-00012, AAS21-00001, AAS21-00002, AAS21-00005, AAS21-00006

B21	Addition to comment B13. Concern that environmental review under SEPA must include all elements of a project and ISD has not completed an application to the City of Sammamish regarding road improvements on 228th Ave SE. Request that the City of Issaquah should suspend environmental review pending receipt of a complete application including the 228th Ave SE and intersection improvements. Question with regards to the need of an elementary school. The most recent District Capital Improvement Plan shows flat enrollment over the next several years and recently the District reported "huge declines" in enrollment which is expected to continue. Removal of the elementary school would save taxpayers funds and reduce traffic to the site. Request for review of the need for the elementary school.	Process; Traffic; Environment; Programming	See Staff Report Section IV.C A City of Sammamish frontage improvement application is not a required submittal for processing land use applications in the City of Issaquah. ISD is responsible for enrollment projections; this is not a criterion for approval that can be considered by the City of Issaquah. An elementary school is an allowed use.
B22	Request for recording of the meeting.	Process	Environmental neighborhood meetings are not recorded.
B23	Concern about traffic disrupting residents' current lifestyle.	Programming; Traffic	See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, VII.A.4
B24	During the meeting participant became concerned that the City does not review materials from ISD before sending them to the general public. A Sammamish study found significantly more traffic than the District's study which did not come up in the meeting on the 28th. Presenters continued to use the District's traffic data. Request that the City of Issaquah obtain and share the City of Sammamish's traffic study and Providence Point reports written by consultants. Request that the City of Issaquah remain impartial. Frustration regarding the materials presented in the meeting. (1) The geotechnical report is still in development due to ISD not providing project plans and construction details, why were these not provided? When will the public be presented with this? (2) In the Critical Areas Study the district has not provided adequate data to support the finding that Wetland C can be completely removed. (3) The SEPA environmental checklist has bland statements which do not allow readers to assess adequacy. (4) The Updated Arborist Report does not provide adequate rationale for removal of 82% of the trees on site. A dangerous precedent would be set if the City allowed weather patterns as a reason for tree removal.	Process; Traffic; Environment	See Attachment 42 "Geotechnical Report prepared by AESI, dated September 17, 2019 and revised June 17, 2021" See Staff Report Section VII.B.2.b, Section VI.E, Sections VII.14.i and j Add reference to critical area report, arborist report, SEAP checklist. Materials are sufficient for land use review, additional review will occur with construction permit submittal. Documents become part of the project file as soon as they are submitted and are made available for public review.

ISD High School #04 Elementary School #17 - Public Comment Summary Matrix

File Nos. PRJ19-00008, SDP20-00001, MSP20-00001, AAS20-00012, AAS21-00001, AAS21-00002, AAS21-00005, AAS21-00006

PRJ19-00008 Attachment 081

Site Development Permit, Master Site Plan, Administrative Adjustments of Standards SDP20-00001, MSP20-00001, AAS20-00012, AAS21-00001, AAS21-00002, AAS21-00005, AAS21-00006				
Comment	Topic	Response		
C1	Traffic impacts do not seem like they have been adequately analyzed. The Campus is only accessible by vehicle and there is only one entry/exit point. How will the additional congestion along 228th be addressed? Will there be additional improvements	Traffic	See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, Section VII.A.4.	
C2	The tree removal and other site improvements will alter drainage patterns and increase the stormwater run off into Laughing Jacobs Creek and Lake Sammamish. The increase in impervious surfaces will be detrimental to the water quality in lake Sammamish. Please use low impact development mechanisms for stormwater control and minimize impervious surfaces by retaining existing vegetation	Environmental	See Staff Report Section VII.E.2, Sections VII.A.14.i and j Intrusion into the buffer will be addressed in the required Native Growth Protection Easement (see Condition 7 of the Staff Report)	
C3	Concerned about the amount of trees being removed on site. Will any parts of the property be restored? How will the impacts of cross country running through any of the retained vegetation be handled? How will the school incorporate the natural landscape into its curriculum	Environmental	See Staff Report Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Section VII.A.14, Section VII.D.B Intrusion into the buffer will be addressed in the required Native Growth Protection Easement (see Condition 7 of the Staff Report)	
C4	The proposed traffic improvements to widen the road are unacceptable. A wider road and more traffic will make 288th Av SE dangerous to turn on to for the communities at Providence point. Do not approve a school on this site there will be significant accidents and congestion due to the school traffic.	Traffic	See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, Section VII.A.4.k, Section VII.A.4	
C5	The traffic impacts of the project are unacceptable and are not mitigated. The roadway is too wide and there is not adequate access to the school campus. It is unsafe to have both an elementary school and a high school share the same campus. The site is not large enough for just one high school, let alone a high school, elementary school, and sports facilities. Why is it necessary to build new sports facilities for this campus, many other school district share a stadium between many high schools. Do we really need a new Elementary school? The development will remove too many mature trees and the proposed replacement trees will not provide an adequate buffer. There will be significant increases in stormwater runoff due to the increase in impervious surface. The impacts to Laughing Jacobs Creek and Lake Sammamish have not been adequately addressed. There should be a full EIS prepared	Traffic; Programming; Environmental	See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, Section VII.A.4, Section IV.B, Section IV.C, Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Section VI.E.2, Section VII.E.2, Section VI.E, Section VII.A.2.b ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.	
C6	Concerned about the number of trees being removed in-between providence point and the school campus. These are mature trees and conserved as much as possible. Concerned that there are not enough parking spots and visitors will attempt to park at Providence Point. Concerned about that new access roads for the campus will negatively effect the emergency access to providence Point	Environmental; Traffic	See Staff Report Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Section VII.A.4, Section VII.A.12	
C7	Elected officials from ISD and the City are ignoring the concerns from providence Point community regarding the impacts on traffic, safety, noise, water runoff, and environmental impacts.	Process	See Staff Report Sections VI.C and VI.D, Section VII.A.13, Section VII.A.9, VII.A.4, Section VII.E.2, Section VI.E	
C8	The traffic impacts and congestion will harm the residents of providence point. There is already speeding on SE 43rd Way.	Traffic	See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, Section VII.A.4.k	
C9	The traffic impacts of the project are unacceptable and are not mitigated. The roadway is too wide and there is not adequate access to the school campus. It is unsafe to have both an elementary school and a high school share the same campus. The site is not large enough for just one high school, let alone a high school, elementary school, and sports facilities. Why is it necessary to build new sports facilities for this campus, many other school district share a stadium between many high schools. Do we really need a new Elementary school? The development will remove too many mature trees and the proposed replacement trees will not provide an adequate buffer. There will be significant increases in stormwater runoff due to the increase in impervious surface. The impacts to Laughing Jacobs Creek and Lake Sammamish have not been adequately addressed. There should be a full EIS prepared	Traffic; Programming; Environmental	See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, Section VII.A.4.k, Section IV.C, Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Section VI.E.2, Section VII.E.2, Section VI.E, Section VII.A.2.b ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.	
C10	The traffic impacts of the project are unacceptable and are not mitigated. The roadway is too wide and there is not adequate access to the school campus. It is unsafe to have both an elementary school and a high school share the same campus. The site is not large enough for just one high school, let alone a high school, elementary school, and sports facilities. Why is it necessary to build new sports facilities for this campus, many other school district share a stadium between many high schools. Do we really need a new Elementary school? The development will remove too many mature trees and the proposed replacement trees will not provide an adequate buffer. There will be significant increases in stormwater runoff due to the increase in impervious surface. The impacts to Laughing Jacobs Creek and Lake Sammamish have not been adequately addressed. There should be a full EIS prepared	Traffic; Programming; Environmental	See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, Section VII.A.4.k, Section IV.C, Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Section VI.E.2, Section VII.E.2, Section VI.E, Section VII.A.2.b ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.	
C11	The traffic impacts have not been adequately addressed. 228th Ave SE is already congested and school traffic will make it unbearable. How are emergency vehicles get through? Who is responsible for building additional lanes? Who is responsible for the right of way? Why is ISD building a new sports stadium instead of sharing the one they already built. Why are so many mature trees being cut down and stormwater runoff being ignored. Climate change and environmental concerns are even more important now.	Traffic; Environmental	See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, Section VII.A.4.k. Section VII.A.4 Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Section VII.E.2	
C12	Concerned about the safety issues of having a high school next to a retirement community. How will issues such as theft and property damage be handled by the school district? This seems like a poor location for a school when ISD already owns other property on East Lake Sammamish where they could build a school	Programming	See Staff Report Section VII.A.9, Section VII.A.14.e, Section VII.A.2.b ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.	

ISD High School #04 Elementary School #17 - Public Comment Summary Matrix PRJ19-00008 Attachment 081
 File Nos. PRJ19-00008, SDP20-00001, MSP20-00001, AAS20-00012, AAS21-00001, AAS21-00002, AAS21-00005, AAS21-00006

C13	The traffic report does not analyze the impact of off peak travel on and off the site such as days with late starts, early dismissals, and lunch. This will make congestion on 228th Ave SE more congested. how will increased congestion effected vehicles entering and existing Providence point Drive SE? How are improvements to 228th Ave SE being coordinated with the City of Sammamish? The existing proposal will build sidewalk along the site frontage but no more. These sidewalks to nowhere will be useless without better planning between ISD, the City of Issaquah, and the City of Sammamish	Traffic	See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, Section VII.A.4.k, Section VI.E.21, Section VII.A.4.c
C14	it seems like a waste of money to build a new stadium when there is a perfectly good one close by that could be shared.	Programming	See Staff Report Section VII.A.2.b ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.
C15	Concerned about drainage issues. The volume of increased stormwater is not addresses in the stormwater and drainage narrative. High volumes of runoff have the potential to overwhelm the providence point stormwater system. These issues should be adequately addressed and ISD should be able to prove that the Providence Point drainage system and property will not be impacted by the increase stormwater from the proposed project	Environmental	See Staff Report Section VII.E.2 See Attachments 53-57, Stormwater Technical Information Reports and related information. Stormwater quality and flow control improvements will cause the site to function (from a stormwater perspective) more like a pre-developed, forested site which is an improvement compared to current conditions.
C16	The new school will not fit into the aesthetics of the surrounding property. ISD should not be allowed to request a variance to the FAR requirements. There is too much development happening on the site already so the scale of the proposal should be reduced. The buffer averaging method is unacceptable because it leaves segments of the buffer that are too thin to be any use. The repropoed replacement trees will be to small to create a buffer. One suggestion could be to install a concrete noise barrier like the ones seen by the highway to create a barrier to the school activity.	Programming	See Staff Report Section VII.A.2.b.c.1, Section VII.A.2, Section IV.B, Section VI.E.2, Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14
C17	Concerned about the impacts of having only one combined entrance and exit to the campus especially during an emergency. It is a safety issues and there will be backup on 228th Ave SE from parent trying to turn into the campus. Why does ISD need to build a new elementary school when they are forecasting a smaller elementary student enrollment in the future?	Traffic; Programming	See Staff Report Section VII.A.4, Section IV.C
C18	Concerned that the campus is only accessible by vehicle. This has negative implications for sustainability and climate changes. Concerned about the impacts of students on the native vegetation and open space on the site. More effort should be put towards restoring and protecting native plantings on the site to compensated for the large loss of trees.	Traffic; Environmental	See Staff Report Section VII.D.D, Section VI.E.2
C19	The impacts of the school on providence point retirement community are not being addressed. This is not an appropriate location to build such a large school campus.	Traffic; Programming	See Staff Report Section VII.A.2.b ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.
C20	Concerned about the impacts of only one combined entrance and exit during emergencies. This will create back up on even a good day. Why does ISD need to build a new stadium when there is a recently remolded one just down the street and they could share facilities. The scope of the this project should warrant a full EIS.	Traffic; Environmental	See Staff Report Section VII.A.4, Section VII.A.13, Section VI.E, Section VII.A.2.b ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.
C21	How is the proposed tree removal consisted with the comprehensive plan requirements and drainage requirements? 228th Ave SE is already too busy with increased traffic from Sammamish. The site is too small for two schools and stadiums. Why is ISD already planning on needing portables in the future? ISD should not be in charge of their own SEPA checklist, this responsibility should be given to the city for an in depended review.	Environmental; Programming	See Staff Report Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Section VII.E.2, Section VII.A.4.k, Section VII.A.13, Section IV.B, Section VII.A.8, Section VI.E
C22	The property is not big enough for both schools. The amount of development creates negative noise and light impacts on the surrounding properties. The stadium should be removed from the project and students should share the existing stadium at Skyline. the elementary school should be removed as well. why is ISD building a new elementary school when enrollment trends are declining. The project should retain large tress and build a fence to create a significant buffer around the entire permitted with Providence point. One combined entry and exit is inadequate for traffic and emergency situations. included congestions will make it harder to access providence point drive. The amount of development will negatively impact drainage systems. how will ISD upgrade the providence point run off system to deal with the increase volume of stormwater. why is there no analysis of the impact of this development on Laughing Jacobs creek or lake Sammamish.	Programming; Environmental; Traffic	See Staff Report Section IV.B, Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14, Section VII.C.2, Section IV.C, Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Section VI.E.2, Section VII.A.4, Section VII.A.13, Section VII.E.2, Section VII.B, Section VII.A.2.b ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.
C23	The property is not big enough for both schools. A new football stadium is not needed on the property. There is not adequate separation between the campus and providence point which leads to concerns about safety. The site is vehicle dependent which means students will have to drive, leading to more traffic issues and congestion. how is this consistent with the Issaquah multi-modal vision? environmental concerns such as tree retention and stormwater run off are not being addressed adequately. COVID19 has made it more difficult for community members to be involved in the process and learn about the project. more time is needed to analyses the impacts	Programming; Traffic; Environmental; Process	See Staff Report Section IV.B, Section VI.E.2, Section VII.A.13, Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Section VII.E.2, Sections VI.C and VI.D, Section VII.A.2.b, Section VII.A.14.e ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.
C24	Traffic safety and noise impacts on the neighborhoods have not been mitigated appropriately. increased congestions will impact the ability of emergency vehicles to access providence point. One combined entry and exit from the site is unacceptable. The removal of so many trees that could have acted as a buffer and alleviate drainage is short sited of the school district. why is it necessary to build a new stadium when there is an existing one that two schools could share.	Traffic; Environmental; Programming	See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14, Section VII.A.4, Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Section VII.A.2.b ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.

ISD High School #04 Elementary School #17 - Public Comment Summary Matrix PRJ19-00008 Attachment 081
 File Nos. PRJ19-00008, SDP20-00001, MSP20-00001, AAS20-00012, AAS21-00001, AAS21-00002, AAS21-00005, AAS21-00006

C25	The process has not been consistent with city regulations due to COVID 19, noticing for public meetings has not been adequate. ISD is not using their Bond funds properly on this project. Why is ISD building a new elementary school when they do not forecast the need for one in their Capital Facilities Plan. ISD is not listening to the neighborhoods concerns about noise and light impacts. combined high school and elementary school campuses are not common and the examples used are not comparable to this situation. ISD is not being transparent and has requested multiple variances to code requirements to get their way. the traffic, environmental, and safety issues that keep coming up are not being addresses adequately. ISD is not planning for the future by building an undersized high school and a new stadium when the existing stadium could be shared. having only vehicle access to the site creates more congestion and safety issues. the buffer proposed between the school campus and providence point is not adequate. stormwater run off is not adequately mitigated. This is a poor site for the proposed development	Process; Traffic; Programming; Environmental	See Staff Report Sections VI.C and VI.D, Section IV.C, Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14, Section VII.C.2, Section VII.A.13, Section VII.B, Section VII.A.9, Section VII.A.4, Section VI.E.2, Sections VII.A.2, VII.A.4, VII.A.12, VII.A.14, Section VII.A.14.e
C26	Don't think there is a need for another stadium when there is an existing one that two schools could share.	Programming	See Staff Report Section VII.A.2.b ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.
C27	Traffic congestion will increase due to this development and the impacts of different school schedules on traffic have not been analyzed. This development will negatively impact the community character by taking down mature trees and disrupt drainage patterns.	Traffic; Environmental	See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, Section VII.E.2, Sections VII.A.14.i and j
C28	There is too much proposed on such a small site. The school district does not need another stadium or elementary school. One combined entry/exit is not enough for rush hour. Increased congestion will negatively effect emergency vehicles. Too many trees are being removed and drainage is not being adequality delt with.	Programming; Traffic	See Staff Report Section IV.B, Section IV.C, Section VII.A.4 Section VII.A.13, Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Section VII.E.2
C29	Voiced concerns about the process, including lack of access to application materials, inconsistencies in SEPA review, and over all process issues. Has concerns about site access, traffic, construction timing, and proposed improvements. Has concerns about environmental impacts including tree removal, wetland impacts, grading, habitat removal and impacts to Laughing Jacobs Creek. Concerned about the stormwater and water flow impacts to other near by properties. Has concerns about the day to day impacts of a school on a retirement community, including safety issues, property values, and quality of life.	Programming; Traffic; Environmental; Process	See Staff Report Section VI.E, Section VII.B
C30	Concerned about the impacts of increased traffic on 228th during morning rush hour. Having only one combined entrance and exit will create major backup. The proposed location is vehicle depended which mean students will not be able to walk to school. This creates more traffic issues and concerns about driver safety with so many student drivers arriving at school. the project will create severe stormwater run off issues, noise issues, and take down mature trees. these negative impacts do not seem like a good enough compromise for another sports stadium. This project should be built with major modifications including removing the elementary school and stadium and more environmental mitigation.	Traffic; Environmental	See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, Section VII.A.4.k, Section VII.A.4, Section IV.B, Section VII.D.D Section VII.E.2, Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14, Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Section IV.C
C31	Concerned about the traffic impacts. Expanding the road to 6 lanes does not seem like an acceptable solution. The safety of residents, student drivers, and pedestrians has not been taken into account when access and parking was determined. The site is too small to accommodate two schools plus sports fields. why can ISD not have two schools share the existing sports stadium down the road. the school design has not taken COVID 19 impacts into consideration. too much development on the site means the unnecessary removal of trees and drainage issues. a full EIS should be considered for this project.	Traffic; Environmental	See Staff Report Section VII.A.13, Section VII.A.4.k, Section VII.A.9, Section VII.A.4, Section VII.A.12, Section IV.B, Section IV.C, Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Section VII.E.2, Section VI.E, Section VII.A.2
C32	A large forested site next to a retirement community is a poor location for a school campus. ISD should spend more time trying to find a more suitable site, or pare down what they are proposing for this one. The physical limitation to the site will create traffic and environmental issues. ISD has not worked in good faith with the community to come to a compromise on pressing issues. The stadium will have a negative impact of neighbors due to light and noise. why is such a large stadium necessary? the surface water implications of such a large grading project have not been properly analyzed, why has a full EIS not been completed? it seems like ISD is trying to get around code requirements like FAR and not meeting city requirements for school development.	Programming; Traffic; Environmental; Process	See Staff Report Section IV.B, Section VII.A.13, Section VII.B, Section VII.C.2, Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14, Section VI.E, Section VII.A.2
C33	The development does not seem to take any of the lifestyle changes from COVID19 into consideration. How will the school buildings and campus be able to adapt to the needs of future generations who may be more susceptible for contagious diseases?	Process; Programming	See Staff Report Section VII.A.2.b ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.
C34	This development project with negatively impact the lifestyle of those in retirement at providence Point by create disturbing the aesthetics of the community, and creating noise, light and traffic issues.	Programming; Traffic	See Staff Report Section VII.A.2.b.c.1, Section VII.C.3, Section VI.E.12-14, Section VII.C.2, Section VII.A.13
C35	Request of information on new 'Proposed Onsite Impervious Coverage, Issaquah HS and Elementary School 21.' Would like clarification about features found on plan that are not in the map legend. Participant voiced concerns about the permitting process and the City's review of the MDSN issues by ISD as of August 11, 2021	Environmental	See Staff Report Sections VII.E.2, Section VII.B
C36	Participant voiced concerns that project impacts have been reviewed thoroughly by all jurisdictions involved. Participate requests that the frontage improvements on 288th be reviewed and permitted by the City of Sammamish prior to the SEPA determination is finalized or land use approvals are issued. Participant is disappointed with the existing interjurisdictional coordination happening for the project.	Traffic; Process	See Staff Report Section VII.A.4.k

ISD High School #04 Elementary School #17 - Public Comment Summary Matrix

PRJ19-00008 Attachment 081

File Nos. PRJ19-00008, SDP20-00001, MSP20-00001, AAS20-00012, AAS21-00001, AAS21-00002, AAS21-00005, AAS21-00006

C37	Participant voiced concerns that ISD has not applied for Right of Way improvements permits from the city of Sammamish. Voices concerns to the city that the MDNS issued to the City of Issaquah is incomplete due to lack of review of on the proposed project by all jurisdictions. Concerned that there will not be enough time to review the staff report and public comments prior to the hearing schedules in September 2021. Concerned there has not been adequate review of critical area impacts, specifically the stormwater run off into Laughing Jacobs Creek. Steep slopes located near Laughing Jacobs Creek do not look like they have been reviewed for critical area impacts. Participant would like to see more thorough review of stream water run off on all portions of the project.	Process, Environmental	See Staff Report Section VII.B The City does not require construction permits to be applied for prior to land use approval
C38	Participate voiced concerns that the TIR Development Memos does not provide an analysis of the cumulative impacts of all the site development on downstream resources. Requests information about how the two memo work together or any other additional information the city can provide	Process; Environmental	See Staff Report Section VII.E.2 See Attachments 53-57, Stormwater Technical Information Reports and related information. Stormwater quality and flow control improvements will cause the site to function (from a stormwater perspective) more like a pre-developed, forested site which is an improvement compared to current conditions.
C39	Participant voiced concerns about the permitting process and requested further information and clarification on what the process will look like after SEPA.	Process	See Staff Report Section VI.E
C40	Participate is concerned that ISD has changed their proposal for the Elementary school so far into the project. Requests information form the city on how this decision will impact the project permitting and determination of impacts. Also voices concerns that the project is in not in compliance with the Issaquah Code Section 18.17.480 and would like further clarification from the City on how the project is meeting the 'built to line' requirement in the City Code. Participant is also concerns about the impacts of converting the Providence Point Looks to emergency use for the school complex. Is concerned that putting a lock on the gate will block access to providence point residents.	Environmental; Programming; Traffic	See Staff Report Section VII.A.4.k, Section VII.A.4, Section VI.E The City does not require construction permits to be applied for prior to land use approval
C41	Participant is concerned that the impacts of not building the elementary school as first proposed have not been adequately analyzed and requests the city require further information from the applicant and a new SEPA process reflecting the updated project.	Environmental; Programming; Process	See Staff Report Section VI.E, Section VII.A.2.b ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.
C42	Participant is concerned about the impacts of not building the elementary school. The participant requests further information about the project will be phase, how the city will review the phased parts of the project, and how to best follow along and participate in the rest of the project.	Environmental; Programming	See Staff Report Section VI.E, Section VII.A.2.b ISD is responsible for programming its sites; the City of Issaquah cannot dictate which accessory facilities are or are not allowed.
C43	Concerned about the number of trees being removed in-between providence point and the school campus. These are mature trees and conserved as much as possible. Concerned that there are not enough parking spots and visitors will attempt to park at Providence Point. Concerned about that new access roads for the campus will negatively effect the emergency access to providence Point	Environmental; Traffic	See Staff Report Sections VII.A.14.i and j, Section VII.A.4, Section VII.A.12